



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/582,757	09/05/2000	Armand Nachev	T2147-906524	2768

7590

11/29/2005

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE P.C.
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
McLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/582,757

Applicant(s)

NACHEF ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2194

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11 - 33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 11 - 14, 17 - 22, 25 - 27, and 30 - 33 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 - 16, 23 - 24, and 28 - 29 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 11 – 33 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 11 – 14, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) page 1 – 2 in view of Carlson, US patent no. 6,405,363.**

4. Carlson reference was cited in the last office action.

5. **As to claim 11**, the APA teaches a method for dynamically generating a run time class (dynamic creation of an object class, page 1) in a computer system, comprising the step of a class having a first member being related to at least one attribute (attribute, page 1) and a second member being related to at least one method (method, page 1).

The APA does not teaches the step of Carlson teaches the step of creating a global generic class having at least one member is an instance of a generic class, the generic class having at least a name as an attribute and deriving the run time class from the global generic class.

Carlson teaches the step of creating a global generic class (one class, col. 5 lines 5 - 20) Carlson teaches the step of at least one member is an instance of a generic class (another class, col. 5 lines 5 – 20) the generic class having at least a name as an attribute (name, col. 4 lines 50 – 58) and deriving the run time class from the global generic class (derives, col. 5 lines 20 – 33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the APA and Carlon's system because Carlson's global generic class and generic class would allow the connecting lines between classes indicate the nature of the relationships between such respective classes.

6. **As to claim 12**, Carlson teaches the step of wherein the first member is an attribute of the global generic class said first member being an instance of a generic attribute class (attribute class, col. 5 lines 35 – 40).

7. **As to claims 13 and 14**, the APA and Carlson do not explicitly teach the step of wherein the second member is a method of the global generic being an instance of a

Art Unit: 2194

generic method class. However, Carlson teaches the step of the aggregation of class relationships (col. 5 lines 5 – 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the containing class or aggregation class can contain or aggregate a second member to be a method class because it provide a capability to dynamically add or delete a extensible item.

8. **As to claim 31**, this is a system claim of claim 11. See rejection for claim 11 above.

9. **Claims 18, 19, 25 – 27, and 32 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) page 1 – 2 in view of Carlson, US patent no. 6,405,363, and further in view of Haven, US patent no. 5,732,263.**

10. Haven reference was cited in the last office action.

11. **As to claim 18**, the APA and Carlson do not teach the step of a command interface.

Art Unit: 2194

Havens teaches the step of wherein the method is implemented in a command interface (input device 22 such as keyboard or mouse, col. 5 lines 45 – 59) used of the computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the APA, Carlon, and Haven's system because Haven's command interface would provide a tool for the user to dynamically creating and manipulating object class.

12. **As to claim 19**, Carlson teaches the step of wherein the global generic class and the generic class is created by a designer (designer, col. 5 lines 65 – 67) who is a computer expert, and a user who may not be a computer expert uses the command interface to instantiate the global generic class created by the designer to generate said object class.

13. **As to claims 25 – 27**, see rejection for claim 18 above.

14. **As to claim 32**, see rejection for claim 25 above.

15. **As to claim 33**, see rejection for claim 19 above.

Art Unit: 2194

16. Claims 17, and 20 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) page 1 – 2 in view of Carlson, US patent no. 6,405,363, and further in view of Stuz, US patent no. 5,485,617.

17. Stuz reference was cited in the last office action.

18. As to claims 17, and 20 – 22, the APA and Carlson do not teach the step of automatically generating the global generic class and the generic class by means of a tool having respective dialog boxes defining attributes of these classes.

Stuz teaches the step of automatically generating the global generic class and the generic class by means of a tool having respective dialog boxes (generating ... using the dialog box, col. 12 lines 6 – 15) defining attributes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the APA, Carlson, and Stuz's system because Stuz's dialog box would provide more user-friendly way of defining attributes of classes.

19. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) page 1 – 2 in view of Carlson, US patent no. 6,405,363, and further in view of Stuz, US patent no. 5,485,617, and further in view of Haven, US patent no. 5,732,263.

20. **As to claim 30**, the APA, Carlson, and Stuz do not teach the step of a command interface.

Havens teaches the step of wherein the method is implemented in a command interface (input device 22 such as keyboard or mouse, col. 5 lines 45 – 59) used of the computer system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the APA, Carlson, Stuz, and Haven's system because Haven's command interface would provide a tool for the user to dynamically creating and manipulating object class.

Allowable Subject Matter

21. Claims 15 - 16, 23 – 24, and 28 - 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2194

(571)272-3763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ph

November 25, 2005



WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100